



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/648,329 | 08/27/2003 | Sung-Ro Go | 1293,1802 | 5351 |
| 21171 | 7590 | 11/09/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| STAAS & HALSEY LLP | | | GIESY, ADAM | |
| SUITE 700 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. | | | | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | 2627 | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 11/09/2009 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***

Application No.

10/648,329

Examiner

ADAM R. GIESY

Applicant(s)

GO, SUNG-RO

Art Unit

2627

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires ____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
 See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

/Adam R. Giesy/
 Examiner, Art Unit 2627

/Thang V. Tran/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2627

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant, on page 4 of the Response, argues that the output signal of the sync pulse separator is not related in any way to a signal transmitted from a composite video signal source to the pickup. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner notes that the input (Bradford - Figure 3, element 44') to the sync pulse separator (45) is the same as the input to the optical pickup (16). As was noted in the previous final Office Action, mailed on 8/31/2009, the phase detector (46) detects a difference between sync pulses from the video signal which are output from the sync separator (45) and the clock signal which is output from (32). The phase detector (46) then outputs a signal to the auxiliary motor (43) which adds or subtracts a rotary component to the optical disc, thus controlling the recording speed to be equal to the transmission speed of the video signal (see column 10, lines 45-69).

Applicant, on page 6 of the Response, argues that Bradford does not teach converting the receiving signal into the recording data by synchronizing with the clock signal generated from the clock generator by synchronizing with a transmission speed of a received signal, and providing the converted recording data to the pickup unit. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner asserts that the recording processing unit (see Bradford - Figure 3, element 44) converts a received signal into recording data (note that signal line 44' is sent to the optical head 16 in order to be recorded onto the optical disc 11) by synchronizing with the clock signal (Examiner notes that the 'synchronizing' occurs thought the elements 46, 47, 43, 42, and 40 - since the speed of the turntable/optical disc is regulated by to match the transmission rate). Examiner further notes that the current claim language merely calls for the recording processing unit to convert data to a recordable data 'by synchronizing with a clock that is synchronized with the transmission speed of the data' - as previously noted, the data is synchronized in that the auxiliary motor (43) increases or decreases the standard motor (12) to rotate the disc at the same speed as the transmission of the incoming data. Examiner asserts that this reads upon the claim language as recited in claims 1 and 15.